

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/720,394 | HWANG, SUNG GI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kenneth B Rinehart | 3749 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kenneth B Rinehart. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Kim. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Padovani, White, Kesling, Onderka.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 3749

The applicant argued that the White reference does not explicitly illustrate two springs and thus would require more significant modifications than merely changing the number of springs.

Additionally, the applicant argued that this is not merely a case of the duplication of a part but the rejection would require the division of the existing spring and thus result in no spring action.

Applicant additionally argued that the proposed invention generates a stronger force than White.

Regarding claim 29 the applicant argued that what Onderka discloses is a calibration structure and not a lock structure and thus was not meant to hold a hook. The examiner stated he would consider the applicant's arguments.


KENNETH R. HART
PRIMARY EXAMINER